

EPA Official Record

Notes ID: AB245E51F85CC66785257831005E0562

From: John Lovell/R3/USEPA/US

To: <jackie.hendricks@readingpa.org>

Delivered Date: 02/08/2011 04:50 PM EST

Subject: RE: 2009 Annual Report

Thanks for the quick turnaround. I guess I jumped the gun on Muhlenburg Foods because I did see the explanation in the annual report after I had sent you the message. Sorry about that.

As far as Exide, generally with facilities that have separate management and authorized representatives, and discharge separately, I would suggest that you permit them separately and consider them separate SIUs even if they are owned by the same company - especially since the company seems to deal with them as separate facilities. However, if Plant One and Plant Two have ceased operations and you only have the Recycling Plant remaining, it seems like the best approach would be to issue a single permit to the Recycling Plant. I'd probably consider the other two to be closed unless there is still some kind of discharge. If there is still some kind of discharge from Plant 1 and Plant 2 you could still consider them separate facilities but non-SIUs.

On Crescent Brass, Deb and I exchanged voice messages, but haven't talked yet. So far I haven't heard from the consultant either. I did talk to their consultant a few months ago and basically told him that as long as the company discharges in violation of the limits and the sanitary discharge has significantly higher levels of pollutants than "normal" sanitary, I thought it was appropriate for their to be a permit and the facility to continue to be regulated. My guess is that the employee showers are contributing a significant concentration of pollutants to the system (dust and metal powder being washed off).

Let me know if you'd like to talk more about Exide.

John Lovell
Pretreatment Coordinator
EPA Region 3
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029
215-814-5790
215-814-2318 (fax - NEW)

▼ ---02/08/2011 10:44:02 AM---The following is from page 2 of the Annual Report: Muhlenberg Foods shut down production in Decembe

From: <jackie.hendricks@readingpa.org>
To: John Lovell/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 02/08/2011 10:44 AM

Subject: RE: 2009 Annual Report

The following is from page 2 of the Annual Report:

Muhlenberg Foods shut down production in December 2008 and did not reopen. In 2009, the City was informed that the facility was permanently closed. Subsequently the building was demolished. Its permit expired on June 30, 2009. This company is not included in any of the spreadsheets or the industrial user listing since it was not in operation for any part of the year.

Exide is generally considered one facility due to ownership. However, the plants have separate management and separate authorized representatives for the Pretreatment Program (authorized representatives have been given this authority from the same VP of the company). Self-Monitoring reports are sent by different individuals. Therefore each plant has a separate permit. The plants are physically separated with separate sampling points but within a single large property complex.

It appears as if the management structure may be changing in 2011 due to the shutdown of operations in Plant One and Two in 2010. If that does go through, I was considering a single permit. Any comments on this? Permits will expire at the end of this year and gives them time to reorganize and the City time to evaluate the new situation. The City will most likely continue to permit at least two of these three plants - if not all three - depending on how the physical reorganization will occur.

On another note, did Deb Hoag ever talk to you yesterday about Crescent Brass? We had a meeting yesterday with the consultant that the company appointed. He most likely will be contacting you if he has not already done so. We have not been successful in getting through to him about the Pretreatment Program. And again, he is not authorized to represent the company within the confines of the Pretreatment Program. Reports for the third quarter were never resubmitted with the signature of the authorized representative as requested in numerous letters from the City. The company therefore is in SNC for Failure to Report for the fourth quarter since these reports for the third quarter are more than 30 days late (due date was October 31st). The reports for the fourth quarter were not submitted at all to date and the City sent two letters concerning this issue. At this point, the reports are not more than 30 days late but I do not expect them to be submitted. This consultant essentially dismisses issues such as SNC, administrative fines and violations. In the appeal he submitted to the City yesterday, he stated that he expects permitting of the facility to cease at the latest with the expiration of the current permit which is September 30, 2011. The City will be meeting with its attorney as the next step.

-----Original Message-----

From: Lovell.John@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Lovell.John@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 08, 2011 9:49 AM
To: Jackie C. Hendricks
Subject: 2009 Annual Report

I'm finally getting to the 2009 annual report for you guys and have a couple of quick questions.

- Muhlenburg Foods was listed in the 2008 report but not the 2009 report, but the 2009 report doesn't list them as having closed. Are they still discharging and if so are they still considered an SIU?
- For Exide, you seem to list it as a single facility but with 3 locations (that seem like they could be next to each other). They also are listed with separate permit issuance dates (although the permit issuance dates are all the same). Is this considered one facility or three? Do they have separate discharge points? Do they have separate permits, or do they have a single permit?

Thanks.

John Lovell
Pretreatment Coordinator
EPA Region 3
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029
215-814-5790
215-814-2318 (fax - NEW)